

2 let hist v. 14. 4
R E M A R K S

UPON THE
CRITICAL PARTS

OF A

P A M P H L E T

LATELY PUBLISHED, INTITLED,

L E T T E R S

TO THE

Rev. Dr. BENJAMIN KENNICOTT,

By Mr. L' A B B É * * *

HEBREW PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF * * *.

By GEORGE SHELTON, M.A. *K*

VICAR OF EDWARDSTON, SUFFOLK, AND FORMERLY OF
TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

"Answer a Fool according to his Folly, lest he be wise in
his own Conceit." PROV. xvi. 5.

L O N D O N:

Printed for T. CADELL, in the Strand.

MDCCCLXXV.

[Price One Shilling and Six-pence.]

R. B. M. A. R. K. I. N. G.

UPON THE

CRITICAL PARTS

OF

P. A. M. F. H. L. E. T.

LATELY DISCOVERED, INSTALLED

I. B. T. T. E. V. R. S.

TO THE

H. D. BENJAMIN K. H. NICOTT

BY M. A. B. E.

NEW YORK: UNIVERSITY OF THE



GEORGE SHIELDON M. A.

VICAR OF EDWARDSSTON, SUFFOLK, AND FORMERLY OF
TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

"As with a foot according to his theory, he is with in
his own Conscience" I know not.

L O N D O N

Printed for T. Cadell, in the Strand

MDCCLXXV

Printed by J. Smith and Son, in the Strand

ADVERTISEMENT.

I. **T**HE Utility of the Doctor's Work
shewn, and the Author's Objec-
tions fully answered.

II. The Author's Charge upon the
Doctor, of an Attempt to corrupt the
Scriptures, confuted.

III. The Doctor's Various Readings
in his Two Dissertations vindicated.

IV. The Author's Superficial Know-
ledge in the Hebrew Language demon-
strated; and his false and inconclusive
Reasonings exposed.

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

I. THE Utility of the Doctor's Work
shown, and the Author's Objec-
tions fully answered.

II. The Author's Charge upon the
Doctor, of an Attempt to corrupt the
Scriptures, confuted.

III. The Doctor's Various Readings
in his Two Dissertations vindicated.

IV. The Author's superficial Know-
ledge in the Hebrew Language demon-
strated; and his false and inconclusive
Reasonings exposed.

REMARKS, &c.

To the AUTHOR.

SIR,

DR. KENNICOTT has asserted in one of his Dissertations, what Cappellus and several learned men had observed, That there were no variations or errors in the present Hebrew Text which affect the faith and practice of Christians; upon which you descant as follows: "If the great Articles of the
" Christian Faith are secured to us in the
" present Text, to what purpose is it to

B

" trouble

"trouble the Church with corrections and
 "innovations which are no ways service-
 "able to Religion?" P. 100—96 *. But
 will it be of no service to Religion, that the
 Church should be assured of so important a
 point as the authenticity of the present Text,
 from the inspection into near 600 Manu-
 scripts, with respect to matters of Faith and
 Practice, for which she had little more than
 the bare word of some learned men, who had
 not the opportunity of making a collection
 of various readings sufficient to ascertain the
 truth of it? Will it be of no service to Re-
 ligion to reconcile those passages in the Sep-
 tuagint Version, quoted by the Inspired Wri-
 ters of the New Testament, which at pre-
 sent vary from the printed Hebrew Text, by
 producing the genuine readings of the said

* The first of these Numbers refers to the French Edition,
 the latter to the English Translation.

Text;

Text; and by restoring it to its pristine purity, remove the differences that now subsist in the Sacred Writings themselves? It will surely be of some service to Religion to furnish the Learned of this kingdom with materials to enable them to give the world in English, their native language, a more correct and intelligible Version than the present is; which has been long desired, and much wished for by many good and learned men. But waving these great and important articles, every man of learning will be pleased to see those irregular letters, which by their uncouth looks are so many blemishes of the present Text, and which the superstitious Rabbins have made the subject of so many ridiculous mysteries, dethroned, and shewn to be only the blunders of careless transcribers. He will own himself indebted to

B 2

the

the Doctor's labours for adjusting contradictions in Chronology; for reducing numbers altogether incredible in the present Text to a degree of credibility; and for ascertaining those that are dubious. He will acknowledge himself obliged to the Doctor for clearing up passages rendered obscure by the misplacing of words; and, what is of some consequence to the Curious at least, for settling the true names of persons and places, which are differently named in different parts of the Text through the carelessness of Copyists.

THE argument you bring to shew the superfluouſness of Dr. Kennicott's undertaking, in p. 3. drawn from the great correctness and high antiquity of the Manuscripts provided by Cardinal Ximenes for the learned Spanish Jews whom he employed

ployed to fabricate his important Edition of the Bible, is of no force, unless you can prove that those copies were the only *castigatissima et antiquissima exemplaria*, as his Eminency is pleased to call them, any where extant; which you will never be able to do. This we are certain of, That no Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch was brought into Europe till the century after the Complutensian Bible appeared in the world; so that this part of the Scriptures wanted the assistance of those Samaritan copies we are now in possession of, towards rendering this pompous Edition of the Cardinal's more correct than it now is. For we may reasonably expect, that the sixteen Copies which the Doctor mentions in his First Dissertation, when carefully collated, will furnish readings that shall be thought of consequence enough to correct the errors of this boasted work in the Pentateuch part of the Bible.

I FLATTER

I FLATTER myself, Sir, that every candid and impartial man of learning entertains the same favourable opinion of this arduous undertaking as myself; is persuaded of the great utility of the Work; and that, when executed, it will do signal service to Religion. But as you have thought proper, from motives best known to yourself, to write a most virulent Pamphlet, in which you have made use of every artifice that a malevolent mind could suggest to stop the further progress of the Work *, by decrying the Doctor's materials, and by setting his learning in the lowest point of light with that part of his Subscribers † which you yourself represent as by far the greatest; who, being unacquainted with this kind of learning, are not qualified to pass a

* Vid. p. 13, n.

† Vid. p. 112, 113.

proper judgment upon your performance, but must take upon trust whatever you shall please to advance concerning these two interesting particulars, his learning and his materials; to undeceive such, I shall examine the critical parts of these Letters, and shew how grossly you have imposed upon them by a parade of learning that you are far from being master of. But as I have answered the arguments you have brought against the utility of Dr. Kennicott's undertaking, I shall wipe off the unjust aspersions you have thrown upon his character by charging him with an attempt to corrupt the Scriptures by introducing barbarous words, and words of no meaning, into them, before I enter upon the main business of this my Address to you.

IN

In page 9, you produce from the Doctor's First Dissertation four words which he has cited out of the printed Text; and though they are evidently errors of the press, as appears from his correcting one of them himself, p. 523, yet you insist upon it, that they are barbarous words forged by him to make the Text appear ridiculous: and you further tell him, that you have convincing proofs of it. Accordingly, you give us three. The first and third are no more to the point, than if you had brought so many passages out of that delectable history * Gulliver's Travels, which you seem so fond of, in proof of what you assert. The second is--Let us see how you have managed it. "You tell us," addressing yourself to the Doctor, "in your

* Vid. p. 105, 101. Fr. Les Folies de Cyrano.

" Second Differtation, that you have
 " found a MS. (an Hebrew MS. you
 must take him to mean from what
 follows) " which, Deut. v. 18. reads
 " לא תנוק, where the printed Text reads
 " ולא תנוק," and then you go on with
 your usual compliment to the Doctor's
 MSS. " I make no doubt, but your MS.
 " has many such blunders in it (barbar-
 ous words you should have said, for
 these are what you undertook to prove
 in your charge against the Doctor);
 " but I challenge you," still speaking to
 the Doctor, " to shew any Edition where
 " the word תנוק is to be found."---As
 if the Doctor had meant, by the printed
 Text abovementioned, the Hebrew printed
 Text; whereas he meant the Chaldee
 printed Text, as I will presently make
 appear, and at the same time convict you

of a wilful misrepresentation of his meaning. Dr. Kennicott, in order to shew the great conformity between the printed Chaldee and the printed Hebrew, produces the following evidence. I will give you the whole passage, as it lies in his Book*:

“ In this same chapter (Exod. xx.), at
 “ ver. 4. the Chaldee MS. (naming the
 “ MS.) reads צלם כל. But the Chaldee
 “ is printed צלם וכל, agreeably to the
 “ printed Hebrew. In ver. 17. this MS.
 “ reads תחמיק ולא חכך, where the
 “ printed Chaldee reads without the ו,
 “ as does the printed Hebrew. And
 “ thus, in Deut. v. 18. this same MS.
 (observe, he is still speaking of a
 Chaldee MS.) “ reads לא תנוק, where
 “ the printed Chaldee and the printed
 “ Hebrew read with a ו before לא.” It

is very clear, that the MS. which has לא חנוף is not a Hebrew, but a Chaldee MS. In this you could not be mistaken; consequently, you have grossly misrepresented the Doctor's meaning. But to make this matter more plain, if possible, take the following scheme of the paragraph fully expressed :

	MS.	Print. Chal.	Print. Heb.
Exod. xx. ver. 4.	אלם כל	אלם וכל	פסל וכל
ver. 17.	חנוך ולא חחמיר	חנוך לא חחמיר	רעך לא חחמד
Deut. v. ver. 18.	לא חנוף	ולא חנוף	לא חנאף

COMPARE Onkelos's Targum with the printed Hebrew, and you will find this a true representation of the paragraph above cited; and consequently, a full confutation of what you have laid to the Doctor's charge.

You are not content with this injurious attack upon Dr. Kennicott's character,

which I have proved to be absolutely false in every particular, but you go on to accuse him, with equal truth, as I will shew immediately, of corrupting the Text by the introduction of words of no meaning into it. The words you have pitched upon, in p. 43—38, to make good this accusation, are נערה for נערה; and דור for דור. It must surprise any one, that shall look into the places of the Doctor's First Dissertation where these two words are, to find a charge of this nature brought against him; the first being read, in p. 416, no less than seven times נערה with a *Resh*; and the other, in p. 461, only once out of nine times דור, all the rest regularly with a *Daleth*. Whence it is plain, that these two words, נערה and דור are errors of the press; and consequently, that the Doctor could not

not intend to introduce them into the Text, by imposing them as genuine upon his readers. Thus, Sir, have I cleared Dr. Kennicott of the charge you have brought against him, of attempting to corrupt the Scriptures, without the least foundation of truth to support you in it. This, I thought, was in justice due to his character, as a man of learning. I shall now enter upon a disquisition of the critical parts of your Letters.

In your Second Letter you present your readers with a list of about 160 variations, which you have picked up from the collation of 5 Hebrew MSS. one Samaritan, and the London Polyglott Samaritan Text*. These you confidently declare to be the best of the Doctor's

* Vid. p. 39—33.

materials, both in respect of their antiquity, and the place where they are found. But, Sir, are not the British Museum, the Bodleian, and the French King's Libraries, places where MSS. of as great antiquity may be found as any in the obscure Libraries of St. Germain de Prés, and Ste Geneviève? This is an artifice to impose upon your readers, which may easily be seen through. These various readings you give us, as a specimen only of the many errors that may be found in the above collated MSS. they being not an hundredth part of what might be produced, as you assure us. p. 15. n. Now, as you have produced these Manuscript readings to shew the wretchedness of Dr. Kennicott's materials, you should not have inserted such in your Collection *, as

* Vid. p. 43—38.

do not, by your own acknowledgement, depreciate the value of the MS. in which they are found : but several of this sort, and diverse others of equal significancy, which I could point out in this specimen of errors, you have given us. But as you have intermixt some readings of equal value with those in the printed Text, and others that shew a deficiency in the Text itself, and so prove it corrupt, with indisputably erroneous variations ; these I intend to discuss : but give me leave first to make some remarks upon your Translations of the various readings themselves, which you profess, in p. 13. n. to have made yourself, for the instruction of the unlearned reader, that he may see how faithfully, judiciously, and learnedly you have informed him of the true sense of them.

I You

I. You have shewn a strange negligence in several of these Translations, not suiting the accuracy you exact of the Doctor in p. 40—35. as p. 15. 1 Kings xviii, 13.

“He” should have been “She;” the Text speaks of Jezebel*; p. 16—15. Josh. i. 15. for “You possess” read “Your possession;” for יְרֵשׁתֶּם is compounded of the substantive יְרֵשָׁה possession, and the suffix כֶּם your. P. 22—19. Exod. 20—10, if the English translation, “Thou shalt not make,” expresses the true meaning of the original French, that is wrong; for in the Hebrew it is “thou shalt not do;” so תַּעֲשֶׂה signifies here, as is plain from the context. P. 27—23. 1 Sam xxv. 16. חֲמִידָה signifies a noise or tumult; not חֲמִידָה, which is a participle from חָמַד tu-

* The sense of the passage requires הַזֶּה to be rendered He that, not He.

multuatus fuit. The two passages you have quoted plainly shew it such, and not a substantive, as you have rendered it. In 1 Kings i. 41. (not i. 14), the Vulgate has *tumultuosa*; and in Prov. xx. 1. *tumultuans*. Besides, the Masoretic pointing might have directed you to the true signification of this word, when you consulted your vouchers. Strange! you should not know the meaning of your own quotations. P. 28—24. מַה the manuscript faulty reading in Exod. xviii. 24. which you translate, “What?” is not a word, but only two letters of no meaning, as is evident from the transcriber’s writing after these two letters מַשׁ, (the word he intended to have written) that he might correct the blunder he had made in leaving out the letter ׁ. So, by the bye, may צִאֲרוּן, which you, with your accustomed accuracy, term faulty by transposition, in p.

30—36, having the genuine word נָתַן written after it, be accounted for. The transcriber in both cases, to avoid deforming his Copy by blotting out his blunders, has let them stand. P. 33—29. Gen. xii. 2, read in the Text, “And be thou,” not “And shall be;” הָיְתָה being the second *perf. sing. imp. kal.* of הָיָה, *fuit*; וְהָיְתָה in the MS. I shall defer speaking to till by and bye.

II. THE following Translations are of another sort; for they either impeach you of an intention to impose upon your Readers, or call in question your skill in the Hebrew Language—two interesting points in regard to your character, both as a Scholar and an Honest Man. P. 15. 1 Kings xviii. 19. הָאֲשֻׁרִי in the MS. you render Affyria: but you are mistaken; for
having

having the local ה affixed, it means to or toward Assyria, Gen. xxv. 18. אַשּׁוּר is Assyria, Gen. ii. 14. P. 17—16. Josh. ii. 9. אַתֶּם you tell us is of no language: consult Pf. xix. 14. and Bythner in loc. he will inform you, that it is irregular for אַתֶּם the first *pers. sing. fut.* Niphal of *integer esse*, and is accordingly translated in our version, “I shall be upright—.” P. 18—16. Josh. iv. 8. besides the inaccurate translation of וַיַּעֲבִדוּם, “And they “have served them;” whereas the word being in Hiphil, it means, “And they “have made them to serve, or enslaved “them.” You have given us a curious critique upon it: “But as the ’ is placed “after כ, say you, the whole word has no meaning.” What? is פָּקִידוֹ, the paradigm of the conjugation Hiphil, a word of no meaning? It has ’ placed after ק, the

second radical of פקד, as י is after נ, the second letter of עבד. In short, יעבדו*, in the MS. is regular by having י placed in it, and יעבדו in the Text is anomalous for want of it, the י being the characteristical letter of the future Hiphil. What could you be thinking of, Sir, when you wrote this blundering piece of criticism, which makes your acquaintance with the very rudiments of the Hebrew tongue suspected? P. 19—17. Gen. ii. 19. חייית, you have announced, not to be Hebrew, which is the 2d *pers. sing. pret. kal.* of חיה *vixit*, and is read in Deut. xxx. 16. That איתם, a very irregular word, should not occur, is not so very strange; but that חייית from חיה, as common a word as any in the whole Bible, did not, must give an intelligent Reader no advantageous opinion

* In the MS.

of your knowledge in the Language you style yourself Professor of. P. 21—19. Gen. vi. 20. your Translation of the Manuscript reading in this passage *מכל אשר רמש הארץ**, “of every thing that creepeth the earth” (or of the earth),” is very extraordinary. Such nonsense must proceed either from a great unacquaintance with the Hebrew, or from a base intention of setting the MS. in a contemptuous light with your readers. But if *אשר רמש הארץ* in Gen. ix. 2. be sense, the Manuscript reading is so. Your mistake in rendering this variation, if it is one, was owing to your ignorance of the different significations of the word *רמש*, which you took to have no other meaning but *reperere*; and as *רמש* taken in that sense, must be the participle *benoni kal*. because of *אשר*, and being without *על*

* So it is in the French.

commonly

commonly used, in this phrase, after it; you concluded that the whole was nonsense, and have translated it so accordingly. But רמש means *calcare* as well as *repere* (*vid. Buxt. Concord. in voce רמש*) so that you should have rendered this various reading “of every thing that treads the ground,” which I suppose gives a sense different from that which you took it in. P. 29—25. Deut. ii. 31. הוא in this various reading means “He,” not “Him,” as is evident from the next verse, whence the transcriber took it through inadvertency. Give me leave to observe, that your Translation does you no credit as an Hebraist; for הוא used substantively is always nominative, and signifies He; it is the affix הו that signifies Him. P. 33—29. “And alas” is your construction of והו, the various reading in Gen.

xii. 2. and xvii. 1. But דר is the second *perf. temp. Imp. kal.* of דרר *fruit*, and means *esto*: it is read in Is. xvi. 4. You either did know this sense of the word דר, or you did not know it. If you did know it, why were you so disingenuous as to give such a ludicrous rendering of it, as makes the Samaritan Text appear quite ridiculous? If you did not know it, this is another proof of your want of skill in the Hebrew.

I COME now, according to promise, to point out to you such of the various readings in the MSS. as are of equal value with those in the Text; and as the signification of them is the same, it is a matter of indifference, according to Bishop Walton, which you admit for the true reading. There are, besides these, some which
the

the sense of the passage, and others which proper authority give a title to a place there, and so render them preferable to the present reading.

Of the first sort are the following;
 P. 15. 1 Kings xviii. 13. בהרית in the MS. you yourself acknowledge to mean the same with בהרנ in the Text; it is likewise established by ver. 4, of this chapter.
 P. 17—16. Josh. iii. 3. ב prefixed to a Verb of the infinitive Mood signifies when, as well as כ; so Ch. vi. v. 5. והיהכמשך הנו
 “And it shall come to pass, when they
 “shall make a long blast, &c.” as it is in our version: So that בראתכם and כראתכם are of the same signification; and consequently either of them may be looked upon as the true reading.

Of the latter, these : P. 15. 1 Kings xviii. 20. גבול seems to have a fairer pretence to a place in the Text, than בני ; as בכל גבול ישראל is in nine passages, and is read in two of them with שלח, Judg. xix. 29. and 1 Sam. xi. 7. besides this, and בני only here. P. 21—19. Gen. vii. 3. המדבור has a just claim to be admitted into the Text, both from the sense of the passage, as appears from the preceding verse, and from the authority of the LXX, Syr. and the Samaritan Text. So, p. 22—19. in Exod. xx. 10. בו has the same claim, upon the same authority, together with that of the Vulgate, and the English Translation, which reads it in Italics. P. 18—16. Josh. v. 10. בראשון in the MS. seems to have been omitted in the Text through mistake, as it is read in three parallel places at the beginning

E of

of the same sentence with that before us, Exod. xii. 18. Numb. ix. 5. and Ezek. xlv. 21. and because the sense of the passage is imperfect without it. P. 26—22. Josh. v. 14. 17 in the MS. clears this place from the obscurity which $\aleph$ in the Text embarrasses it with, if you render $\aleph$, the next word, "surely," which sense it sometimes bears, as in Numb. xxii. 33. the LXX and Syr. both read 17. P. 34—30. Gen. xxii. 16. מִמֶּנִּי, which you very pertinently call "a very curious addition," merits a place in the Text, if the LXX, Syr. and V. L. carry any authority with them, and the parallel place, v. 12 of this Chapter, be any proof that it was originally there. Ib. Gen. xxiii. 5. The manuscript $\aleph$, in this passage, seems to furnish a better sense according to the LXX, than 17 in the printed reading; and is confirmed by ver. 11 of this Chapter.

Thus,

THUS, Sir, you have inadvertently furnished us with several authentic readings from those very Manuscripts, which you have taken such pains to represent as contemptible and of no value.

BEFORE I dismiss this Second Letter, there are several particulars in it, upon which I shall take the liberty to make some observations.

1. YOUR partiality to the Printed Text in disfavour of the Manuscript readings, in the following instances, is very observable : P. 16—15. You have announced וְיָ plural in the MS. in 1 Kings xviii. 24. faulty, because יָ is singular in the printed Text. In Numb. xxi. 7. p. 26—22, you have declared וְיָ to make no sense in the passage where it is,

for no other reason but because the Text reads ויאמר; though the word יאמר is the Nominative to ויאמר in the MS. as well as to יאמר in the Text. Do you, Sir, see no inconsistency in thus indiscriminately condemning the Manuscript readings in both cases, as faulty? You have likewise passed the same sentence upon ויעל; in Judg. ix. 51. p. 26—33. because the Text has ויעל; though it is genuine Hebrew by a rule of your own, p. 47—42: as having ראשונים, a Plural Nominative. Hence it appears, that if ויעל in the first instance be erroneous, ויאמר and ויעל in the two last must be so too: consequently, by this unfair treatment of the Manuscript variations, you have actually proved two passages in the Text to be corrupt.—This it is to be acute.

102. You have charged the Cambridge MS. N^o 68, with upwards of 3300 faulty readings; enow of all reason, in the opinion of persons not acquainted with this kind of learning, to condemn any MS. whether Hebrew, or of any other language, as stark naught. But I can assure such, that, in the Hebrew part of the Septuagint only, I myself have counted up, in the Alexandrine Copy, according to Grabe's edition, above 6200 erroneous readings. That there are repetitions, insertions, additions, rasures, transpositions, and omissions, in this most valuable MS. is a thing well known to the learned, who with all its imperfections have held it a treasure of inestimable price, both on account of its venerable antiquity, and of its great usefulness not only in explaining the Hebrew

brew Text, where obscure, but in correcting it, where faulty. So that a MS. whether Hebrew or Greek it matters not, may have a considerable number of errors, and yet have great merit: consequently, Dr. Kennicott's encomium of this MS. may be very just, notwithstanding the many faults you have amassed together to shew the contrary.

In p. 24—21. you tell us, That one Jacob Levi has affixed a double date to the age of this MS. the one, the year of the Creation; the other, that of Herod's building the Temple, which you call the Third Temple. To shew your wonderful exactness in ascertaining the age of this MS. you have given us a learned calculation to prove that it is just 13 years older according to the latter, than it is according

according to the former date; for it was written in the year of the World 4610, according to the era of the Creation; but by your calculation A. M. 4597; for 610, the minor computus of Jacob Levi's account, added to 3987, in which Herod's Temple was built, gives that number. What pedantry! to tire your reader's patience with such useless accuracies. Dr. Kennicott, who you say ought to have made this calculation, had more sense than to trouble him with such an impertinent shew of learning. You have made a considerable mistake in calling Herod's Temple the Third Temple, contrary both to Scripture and Antiquity*. According to Haggai's Prophecy, Christ was to appear in the Temple built by Zorobabel, as is plain † when he says, "That the glory of this

* Ch. 2. v. 7.

† 1b. v. 9.

"House,

“House,” meaning Zorobabel’s Temple,
 “should be greater than that of the for-
 mer;” so that both this and Herod’s must
 go under the denomination of the Second
 Temple, otherwise Haggai’s Prophecy was
 not fulfilled. Josephus de Bello Jud. vi. 4.
 speaking of the destruction of the Temple
 by the Romans, expressly calls it the Se-
 cond Temple, though built by Herod*,
 and the Jews ever since have expected their
 reigning Messiah, the Son of David, to
 make his appearance in a third Temple,
 which is to be far more glorious than
 either of the former two.

3. You acquaint your reader, that you
 have made a remarkable discovery in the Sa-
 maritan Text of no less than two Rabbinical
 words, and one Chaldee word, רר', רר',
 רר',

* Vid. Poli Syn. in Hag. ii. 10.

and

and ית. P. 35—30. “Do not you know,
 “then,” to write in your own style, that
 the two first of these words are either Rab-
 binical or genuine Hebrew, according to
 what points they are read with; for בחר
 the participle Pahul of בחר *dissecuit*, is
 Hebrew; בחר *inciso*, is Rabbinical; so רבי
magister, is Rabbinical, and, רבי the plural
 in construction of רבי *princeps*, Jer. xxxix.
 13. Hebrew. So that you had no right to
 call these two words Rabbinical, since it
 is plain that they are likewise genuine
 Hebrew. This is an artifice of your's to
 depreciate the authority of the Samaritan
 Pentateuch, by making them pass for such.
 ית indeed is Chaldee; but that you should
 be surprised to meet with a Chaldee word
 in the Pentateuch, is an instance of a strange
 piece of forgetfulness, when both דת and
 אתה in Deut. xxxiii. 2. a passage you have

commented upon in these Letters, are Chaldee; and stranger still, that you should be so little acquainted with your Bible, as not to know that there are abundance of Chaldee words scattered up and down in the Hebrew part of it.

4. In the next page you give us a list of the names of 18 persons and places, out of 95 in this Samaritan Text, which you affirm “ never existed, and of “ which no Translation of the Bible makes “ any mention:” whereas מושון, in Gen. x. 2. the very first of them, is read by the LXX Μοσοχ; by the Syr. and V. L. Mosoch. Ch. xxxvi. v. 27. זוען, the LXX reads Ζουναμ or * Ζουναμ, according to Castell. In 1 Chron. vii. 1. you find פואה, the last

* Vid. Animad. Sam. in Text. Heb. & Sam. Walt. Pol. Vol. VI.

word but one of this list, to which may be added מִיִּנְתֵּר, the last word of all; of which both Mintert, in his Lex. N. T. and Leusden in his Onomast. say, that *Αχεν*, in Matt. i. 14. is the Translation. If you had had any regard for your reputation as an Author, give me leave to tell you, Sir, you never would have risked it upon such a bold assertion as this; of the truth of which it was impossible you could be assured, and whose falsity is so easily detected.

Thus, Sir, I have gone through your Second Letter; in examining which I have discovered a great deficiency of knowledge in the Hebrew Language; and have likewise shewn a manifest intention of imposing upon your readers in several particulars. I shall now offer

some remarks upon your Third Letter, in which you have favoured us with a short analysis of the Hebrew tongue; to which I have nothing to object: only, your notion relating to the Paragogic Letters I can by no means subscribe to, for the following reasons:

Your doctrine concerning these letters, as delivered p. 57—52. is, that “They
“are used to encrease or lessen the force
“of words to which they are joined.” I have examined all the Texts you have produced in this Letter to establish your opinion, and do not find that our Translation, or any ancient Version in the London Polyglott, conveys the least idea of an energy in any single one of them; whence I conclude, that your gloss upon each of them is altogether imaginary. I have
likewise

likewise consulted the following Gramma-
 rians, viz. Buxtorf, Pagninus, Schindler,
 Ludovicus de Dieu, Schickard, Glaffius,
 Bellarmine, Bythner, and Mascleff; some
 of whom take no notice at all of these
 letters; others are of opinion, that they
 were added *euphonie gratia*; but none
 of them give the least distant hint of
 an encreasing or lessening force belong-
 ing to any of them. Only Buxtorf, in
 his Thesauro p. 69. allows, that the latter
 n, in words with a double Feminine
 Termination; such as, *trivium*, *omnimoda*
salus, may be Paragogic, and the former
 changed into n *euphonie gratia*: but far-
 ther he is quite silent, as far as I can find,
 in regard to these letters. I wish you
 had been so obliging as to have informed
 your readers, to which of the Gramma-
 rians

rians * you profess yourself to be only
the echo you stand indebted to for this pe-
culiar notion of them.

In the latter part of this Letter you
have given us several directions how we
may come at the true sense of the Pro-
phets; and among these you have com-
municated to us the Rule of Reticency,
by which you think you can do wonder-
ful feats; and, as a specimen of your
skill, have favoured us with the explica-
tion of the following passage in Hosea

Ch. i. v. 2. *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשׁוּבָה*

וְיִשְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשׁוּבָה : *וְיִשְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשׁוּבָה*

וְיִשְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשׁוּבָה : *וְיִשְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשׁוּבָה*

P. 67—63. This difficult place of
Scripture has been variously expounded

178

* Vid. p. 71—68.

by

by different Commentators, both Jews and Christians. Some, as Dr. Pocock observes, will have what is said really done, others only represented in a vision; others, again, that it was only proposed as a parable; all which various opinions are attended with considerable difficulties, as appears from that great and learned man's Commentary upon the place. But you have taken a different way in interpreting it, from every one of these Expositors: I shall therefore enquire, whether you have been more successful in your explication than any of them.

HAVING informed your reader of the amazing number of Hebraisms and difficulties contained in this passage, you first of all remove the veil cast over it by the enigmatical term Whoredoms, by shewing that the Scriptures generally describe

describe Idolatry by the terms Fornication and Adultery. Next you start what you call an insuperable difficulty, by proving that God could not command the Prophet to marry a Wife of Whoredoms, taken either in the literal sense, or in the figurative for Idolatry, because it would have been commanding him to act in breach of two of his own Laws, viz. Lev. xxi. 7. which you, through mistake, understood to be a general prohibition of contracting marriage with a Whore; whereas it relates only to the marriage of the Priests, and so does not reach the case of the Prophet: Neither does the interdiction of marrying an idolater, in Deut. vii. 3. as being confined to the Seven Nations, prove that the Prophet would act in breach of one of God's Laws in marrying such an one. To solve the above insuperable difficulty, you

you first insert *procrea* between the copulative ו and ילדי in ילדי; and then by clapping in ארץ, your Reticent word, between אשה and זנונים in the former member of the sentence, and between ילדי and זנונים in the latter, the business is done; so that the Prophecy according to your interpretation of it runs thus :

ויאמר יהוה אל חושע לך קח לך אשה בארץ זנונים
וחלד (procrea) ילדי בארץ זנונים

And the Lord said unto Hosea, "Go take thee a Wife "in the land" of Whoredoms, and "beget" children "in the "land" of Whoredoms.

ALL this is very ingenious: But unluckily the Hebrew language will not admit of the insertion of a word between ילדי and זנונים, the former being in construction with the latter; so that ילדי זנונים in the

Text must be rendered "children of whoredoms;" and consequently אִשְׁתּוֹ זִנָּיִם must likewise be translated "a Wife of Whoredom;" because these Children of Whoredoms were to be the issue of the Woman that the Prophet was commanded to take to Wife; and they could not be the Children of Whoredoms, but on account of their Mother. I vehemently suspect, Sir, that in this piece of criticism you have not paid a sufficient attention to the genius of the Hebrew language; and because *procrea filios in terra fornicationum* is good Latin; you therefore took הוֹלֵד (the Hebrew for *procrea*) יֶלְדֵי בָאָרֶץ זִנָּיִם to be good Hebrew: If so, this is destroying the nature of the Hebrew language with a witness, and putting it upon a level with the Western Tongues, which you accuse Dr. Kennicott of doing in p. 78—74.

I HAVE

I HAVE done with your Third Letter. I shall now enter upon a discussion of the Fourth, the main business of which will be to vindicate those Various Readings in Dr. Kennicott's Two Dissertations *, "whose folly and weakness you believe you "have sufficiently shewn in this Letter," by invalidating the arguments brought against them; and at the same time offer a word or two in his defence, when your contumelious treatment of him shall give occasion. . . But, first, give me leave to make a few strictures upon a passage or two in this Letter, as we go along.

You usher in this Letter with *Arma virumque cano*; and bloody doings we must expect; But perhaps all this blustering

* P. 84—81.

will, at last, turn out an harmless gasconade; a species of boasting much in use amongst the inhabitants of a neighbouring kingdom.

P. 78—75. “The marginal notes, “meaning the Keri,” you say, “only “serve three times out of four to mark “the Hebraism, and not to announce a “fault in the Text.” But Cappel-
lus, Bishop Walton, and Dr. Prideaux, assign the Keri no such province. The first, in his Arcan. Punct. Revel. calls them expressly, *correctiones vocum vitiosæ scripturarum*. Lib. i. Ch. vii. § 4. The second, in his Proleg. to his Polyglott Bible, p. 45. terms the Keri *varias codicum lectiones*. The last, in his Connect. Vol. I. p. 331. looks upon the Keri Cetib to be corrections of errors, which have crept into
the

the Text through the negligence or mistakes of transcribers. From hence it appears, that these three eminent Hebraists either were not acquainted with, or, if they were, did not approve of your peculiar use of these marginal notes. This presumptive argument from their silence appears to me so strong, that I must beg leave to suspend my assent to your opinion, till I am informed by better authority than your *ipse dixit*. I am surprised, that you should assign so small a portion of the Keri for the correction of the Text as a fourth part, the contrary of which will appear, as clear as the sun at noon-day, true to any one that shall look into Cappellus's *Critica Sacra*, in that part where he treats of the Keri. If, as you say a little farther on in this paragraph, the Kerij יאמר

and

and יִדְבָּר of יֹאמֶר and יִדְבָּר be to mark the Hebraisms, why have not תִּרְדּוּ, in Job. xii. 7. and יִלֵּךְ, Gen. xxxv. 26. which you yourself acknowledge to be Hebraisms, 47—42: their Keris, תִּרְדּוּ and יִלְכוּ, to point them out as such? But they have none; consequently, ויֹאמְרוּ and וידברו are corrections of the Text.

YOUR assertion in the next page, that the Seventy in their version have divested the Hebrew of its Hebraisms, is either a misrepresentation of these interpreters; or, to serve your argument, argues a very slender acquaintance with that version, every page of which abounds with Hebraisms, as any one may convince himself by comparing the Greek with the original Hebrew.

COME

COME we now to your critique upon the Doctor's Various Readings, which you distinguish into those he has not reasoned upon, and those he has. Of the former sort are the six following:

I. P. 79—76. Lev. iv. 29, instead of במקום העלה in the Text, the MS. reads במקום אשר ישחט העלה. To prove this Variation to be the genuine Reading, Dr. Kennicott has produced two parallel places, the 24th and 33d verses of this Chapter, further established by the authority of the LXX, Syr. and Samaritan Text; and yet you bestow upon it the epithet “wretched.” What evidence, let me ask you, would you require fuller and stronger than the authority of parallel places, and ancient versions, together with that of the Samaritan Text, to render this Various Reading respectable?

respectable? I shall therefore take the liberty not only to exempt this Variation out of the number of those you reckon weak and despicable, but even venture to announce the Reading in the Text faulty and corrupt. The Doctor has observed, that this Various Reading renders the passage "more clear" than that in the Text; the sense of which words you evidently pervert, by making them imply the removal of an ambiguity. No, Sir; this sense with no colour of truth can be put upon them. The common meaning of rendering a passage in any writing "clear," is to free it from all obscurity, that so it may become more plain and intelligible: undoubtedly this is what was meant by the words "more clear" in this place. Besides, you offer an affront to the understanding of an intelligent reader, in endeavouring to persuade

suade him, that the Doctor by the expression "more clear," took במקום, in the Hebrew, for an equivoque, because "in the place of" is one in the English. For is it credible, that a person so conversant in the Hebrew as Dr. Kennicott must be, when he wrote his First Dissertation, should be ignorant of the meaning of so common a word as מקום? You must excuse me, Sir, if I cannot prevail upon myself to credit such an improbability, imposed upon the reader by a mean, low, quibbling upon words.

II. P. 86—77. Judg. xv. 11. MS.

וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע דָּלִיד מִן הַכָּהֵן. You object against the repetition of Samson's name; "because he was alone in the cave (or, according to the Text, on the top of the rock) and there was none to answer but he." But was he

less alone in the next verse, where you read
 וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם שְׁמֹעוּן, the very same phrase
 as that in the MS. ? So that your argument,
 weak as it is, militates equally against the
 printed Text in this verse, as it does against
 the MS. in the preceding. As to the
 “uselessness of repeating Samson’s name,”
 there seems to be full as little reason, or
 rather less, to mention it after he had com-
 muned with the children of Judah, than
 there was before. The “propriety of this
 repetition, though in the same verse,
 depends upon the usage of the Hebrew
 language, which frequently repeats the
 Substantive to supply the place of the
 Pronoun. These considerations enforced
 by the authority of the LXX, which reads
 it, give no small weight in favour of the
 genuineness of this Various Reading.

III. IN 1 Chron. xii. 3. the word **המלך** is omitted, which is read in 2 Sam. v. 3. the genuineness of which latter Variation, the Doctor confirms by the authority of the Vatican Septuagint; and he might have added likewise that of the Syriac, which reads **המלך** in Chron. Upon which you ask, "Supposing *King* was originally in the Bible, would the suppression of it in the printed Text be a corruption or omission of any great consequence?" With respect to the sense of the passage, of none at all, because it makes no alteration in it; but in regard to the correctness of the Text, it is; to give which in its original purity is the business of the Doctor's undertaking.

IV. 2 Sam. xxiii. 4. וּמִאֲחֵר בֶּקֶר יִרְחַח יְהוָה שֶׁמֶשׁ. However inexplicable you may think this Manuscript Reading to be, I will venture to give the following interpretation of it. "And He (the just Ruler mentioned in the preceding verse) "shall
 " be as the light of the morning, when
 " the Lord arises, dispersing, like the sun,
 " the clouds of adversity, which obscured
 " his happiness." That this is no incongruous sense of שֶׁמֶשׁ in apposition with יְהוָה, may be gathered from * Ps. lxxxiv. 11. where the Lord (יְהוָה) is said to be
 " the fan (שֶׁמֶשׁ) to them that walk up-
 " rightly." † By this just Ruler some Commentators suppose, that David would be understood to mean himself; and as he is a type of Christ, consequently that

* Vid. Patrick in loc.

† Vid. Pol. Syn. in loc.

these last dying words are a prophecy of the Messiah,

V. P. 81—78. Exod. x, 18. The MS. reads—וַיֵּצֵא מֹשֶׁה מֵעַם מִצְרָיִם. Upon which reading you observe, that “The omission of the word מִצְרָיִם, is not only “no fault in the printed Text, but the “addition your MS. makes of it is very “improper.” And to prove this, you refer your reader to verse the 16th of this Chapter, where both Moses and Aaron are said to be sent for by Pharaoh; then you conclude, that if any Nominatives are to be added, Moses and Aaron must; and to confirm this, you produce Ch. viii. v. 8. of this book, where they are both expressly named as going out from Pharaoh *: and then there is as great an outcry,

* Vid. p. 103—100.

as if you had found the copy of the Creed that the wild Indian ran away with into the woods.—“It is as clear as the day,” say you.—But stop a while, good Sir, do not exult too fast; hear what may be alledged in favour of the Manuscript Reading. In the history of the Ten Plagues we read, that Pharaoh called for Moses and Aaron no less than four times. Exod. viii. v. 4. both are called, and both are said to go out as above, v. 8. Ib. v. 21. they both are sent for a second time, and v. 26. Moses is only mentioned as going out from Pharaoh. So in like manner the third time, Ch. ix. v. 27. and v. 33. no mention is made of Aaron, but of Moses only, when they went out: the fourth time is the passage before us. Hence it appears, that the reading in the MS. however improper you think it, is conform-

conformable to two out of three parallel places in the printed Text; and that the printed Text itself, in this place, is so to none of three: and as it is confirmed by the concurrent testimony of the LXX. V. L. and Syr. all which read $\pi\omega\rho$, I may, with truth on my side, announce this Various Reading in the MS. genuine, and consequently That in the Text corrupt.— You inform the reader in this paragraph, that Dr. Kennicott spends the time of the Public to very little purpose, by producing this Variation; in proof of which, you have here given a specimen how you spend your's, viz. in forming arguments in defence of the Scriptures, which turn out, when examined, to shew them corrupt. Which of you spend your time most for the service of Religion, let the reader judge.

VI. 2 Sam. xiv. 26. The MS. in this passage reads למשקל, the printed Text למשקל. Now, as these two words are of the same import, and mean the same thing, viz. the weight of a Shekel, in this place; it matters not, as I have before observed of such Readings, which of them has a place in the Text; you are therefore in the wrong to charge this Various Reading with folly or weakness. Your unfair dealing with Dr. Kennicott, in representing him ignorant of the meaning of למשקל in this passage, is justly reprehensible; when the expression "or more literally" in his First Dissertation, p. 463, plainly shews that He was acquainted with the figurative sense of it. Yet, notwithstanding this, you pour in upon your reader an inundation of Texts to prove this unjust surmise. But what was my astonishment when I read, in this

paragraph,

paragraph your curious Dissertation upon the different weights of a stone, written indeed for the information of the Doctor, but calculated only for the perusal of * Ironmongers, Butchers, Glaziers, and Wool-combers.

HAVING shewn the invalidity of your arguments brought against these six Variations to prove what you intended, I shall make some remarks upon the two remaining Various Readings, which you distinguish by the title of those that the Doctor has reasoned upon; and in criticising upon which you undertake to shew, that his corrections are as arbitrary and wretched, as his reasonings are false and inconclusive. The Readings are Deut. xxxiii. 2. and Psal. xvi. 10.

• Vid. locum.

THE first of these is as follows :

ואחז מרכבה קדש מימיו אש דת למן : Deut. xxxiii. 2.

P. 87. l. 20—84. l. 1. In this paragraph you have charged Dr. Kennicott with joining the names of two different places to make מריבת קדש, viz. מריבת and קדש, though he has produced the two following passages, Deut. xxxii. 50. and Ezek. xlviii. 28. where it is read the name of one place. I challenge you to bring any one passage in the whole Bible where מריבת is read as the name of a place. Why will you impose upon your readers not only by concealing the truth, but by uttering such a falsity? As to the omission of the letter מ in מריבת קדש, which you call a violation of the rules of Grammar, 'tis something strange, that you, who pretend to be so intimately acquainted

ed with the peculiarities of the Hebrew language, should not know, that there is no one of them that occurs in the Scriptures more frequently than the omissions of the letters which form the technical word נכלם. If you want to be satisfied of the truth of this, consult Noldius. Besides, as the Doctor himself had sufficiently obviated this cavil, one would not have expected to have heard any thing of it from you.

IN p. 89—85. you infer from the Doctor's saying קדש "is not Saints, but Holiness," that he was unacquainted with any other acceptation of the word but that. Was the Doctor obliged to enumerate, in this place, every meaning that the word קדש bears? He has given that which occurs most frequently; and that

is sufficient. But even you yourself, with all your accuracy, have not given us every signification of this word; there is one that has escaped you in Deut. xxiii. 18. So much for this frivolous and trifling criticism.

P. 90—86. The reason that Dr. Kennicott assigns for excluding מן out of the Text is, "This word is Chaldee, and is not found in any of the books before the Captivity, except in this place." To invalidate which you very sagely reply, "You know very well, that the Samaritans never wrote any book after the Captivity." Do not you see, Sir, the absurdity of this paragraph, which implies, that the Samaritans had written some books of the Scriptures before the Captivity? One might ask you, Where you met

met with this extraordinary copy of the Bible where these Samaritan Scriptures are? Whether in the Library of St. Germain de Prés, or in that of Ste. Genevieve*, those sole repositories of valuable Hebrew Manuscripts? The Learned World, nodoubt, would be highly obliged to you for a sight of so great a curiosity.

Your ingenious translation of *מימנה לון* *מימנה נור*, the Samaritan version of *מימנה* *אורה* *למי אשרה* in the Text, comes next to be examined, p. 92—89. Your interpretation of each word is as follows: “The Hebrew reads *מימנה*, *in his right hand*, in the masculine, and your version has *מימנה*, in the feminine.” “The second is *נור*, which signifies, in Hebrew, a *Lanthorn*,” “The third is *אורה*, *light*.”

* Vid. p 39—33.

“The fourth is לָ, which signifies *to lodge*.” From the several significations of which words you have fabricated the following curious version of this passage: “She lodges in her right hand a Lanthorn of Light.” I am at a loss, Sir, which to admire most, the profound ignorance you have betrayed in your Translation, or the insolence you treat Dr. Kennicott with in this paragraph. For though you have taken the Samaritan affix ה in מִימִינָה, which is * generally † masculine, through an evident ignorance of the language, for the Hebrew affix ה, which is always feminine; yet you have the assurance, in the above-mentioned page, to accost the Doctor with, “Stop, Sir, this is not strictly true;” and to take your leave

* Read the Samaritan Version, and you will find it so.

† Vid. Castell's Polyglott Grammar prefixed to his Lex.

of him with, "Why then do you im-
 "pose upon us?" Such gross ignorance
 brazened out with so consummate an ef-
 frontery, must highly disgust every intel-
 ligent reader.

THE second word נר, you say, "in
 "Hebrew, signifies a *lanthorn*, and in
 "Chaldee *fire*." It means, indeed, both
 in Chaldee and Samaritan, "fire;" but
 so far is it from signifying "a lanthorn" in
 Hebrew, that it is never used in that
 language in Scripture at least, as appears
 from its being unpointed in the Lexicons:
 the word in use is נ. But any thing
 may be excused in an Orientalist that
 cannot distinguish between an Hebrew
 verb and a Samaritan affix, as is evi-
 dent from your translating

THE fourth word לון, "to lodge."
 Had I no other reason to suspect your
 slender

slender acquaintance with, or rather total
 ignorance of, the Samaritan, this Tran-
 slation of the word לון is sufficient to con-
 vince me of it. For had you known that
 לון was the Dative of ון, the Samaritan
 plural affix of the third person, which
 in this Samaritan Version is the constant
 interpretation of להם and אליהם in the
 Hebrew Text, and of למו in this passage,
 you never would have gone so far out of
 your way as to drag in by the head and
 shoulders an Hebrew word, and assign it
 a meaning so foreign to the sense of the
 passage before us, and in which signifi-
 cation the Samaritan Version never uses it;
 for אכירת is the word it uses for *to lodge*;
 and not לון; as Gen. xxiv. 23, 25. Ib.
 xxxii. 13. Numb. xxii. 8. in all which
 places the Hebrew reads לון, and the
 Version אכירת.

THUS,

Thus, Sir, I have examined your Translation of the Samaritan Version; and sufficiently shewn, that you have attempted to render a passage, the language of which you are totally unacquainted with, by betraying an ignorance of its very rudiments. But I must not dismiss you thus—Your insolent behaviour to Dr. Kennicott I have already censured. I shall now expose your disingenuous representation of his correction of the latter part of the second verse, viz. מִיְמֵינוּ לְמֹאשְׁאֹר.

THE Doctor's Lat. Tran. *E dextra ejus ignis luxit ipsis.*

YOUR'S. *In dextra ejus ignis luminis ipsis.*

THE chicanery of your Translation is very apparent; for you have taken מִיְמֵינוּ

substantively; whereas the Doctor has proved it to be a Verb, and has accordingly translated it *luxit*. So that by putting your own construction upon his words, yours is a very unfair Translation; a fallacy, let me tell you, wholly unbecoming a Man of Letters. Your English Translation is rather more unfair than your Latin. Here take it together with the Doctor's:

THE Doctor's. "From his right hand
"the fire shone forth upon them."

YOUR'S. "In his right hand a lanthorn
"of light for them."

WHERE, Sir, did you ever meet with
~~UN~~ to signify a Lanthorn? No where.
 You have very artfully, though not very
 fairly, transferred the word Lanthorn,
 which

which you had translated נור by in the Samaritan Version, to this place, in order to make the Doctor's correction appear ridiculous.

P. 101—97. Pf. xvi. 10. לא תחזן חסידך לראות שחת. This is the other passage, in discussing of which you threaten Dr. Kennicott to shew, that his corrections are as arbitrary and wretched, as his reasonings are false and inconclusive,

THE argument you bring, p. 107—103, to prove that the latter in חסידך does not corrupt the word, is founded upon a misrepresentation of the nature of the Masora, which you affirm has ordered the word to be printed in the Text, upon which you lay the stress of it, by saying “ a better proof cannot be adduced, that

“the word is not corrupted.” But the Masorets were so far from ordering this or any other word to be printed in the Text, that out of a superstitious regard for the sacredness of it they have left untouched all those blunders committed by careless transcribers, noted by קרי ולא כתיב, words written, but not read; כתיב ולא קרי, read, but not written; יותר, redundant; חסר, wanting; and faulty Readings occasioned by writing one letter for another, of which sort you may find abundance in turning over your Bible; all which corruptions, I say, these critics have left in the Text as they found them there (placing their corrections in the Margin), without presuming to remove out of it those words or letters they thought faultily written, or to insert such as they judged to be wanting. This superstitious scrupulosity of
the

the Masorets, in making any alteration in the Bible, accounts for our reading מְשִׁיח in the present printed Text, though they have both by their מְ and punctuation ordered it to be read מְשִׁיח , which plainly enough shews the insufficiency of your arguments to prove the genuineness of the latter, in מְשִׁיח .

Ib. That the latter, in מְשִׁיח is annexed, as you assert, to denote the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, is as odd a conceit as ever entered into the pate of a Jewish Rabbī. The truth is, This, about which you have given us such various conjectures, is nothing else but one of the *matres lectionis*, and has been used by the Masorets to denote *Sheva* under the preceding letter, as appears from the punctuation of מְשִׁיח , in

Pf. lxxvii. 20. in particular; as also in
 Josh. x. 8. 1 Sam. xxvi. 8. 2 Sam. i. 16.
 1 Kings. i. 27. Ib. viii. 26. in the words
 of all which passages the Masora notes the
 'at the end of them redundant, and has
 pointed the preceding letter with a *Sheva*,
 as it has done ׀׀׀׀, to denote them
 singular. To explain the usage of this
 letter ' a little more fully to persons not
 much acquainted with this kind of litera-
 ture, I shall with your leave do it by in-
 forming them, That before the invention
 of the Masoretic points, the three letters
 ׀׀׀ were used to express the vowels by,
 which went by the name of *matres lec-*
tionis, as if the language could not be
 read without their assistance; and like-
 wise, that upon the introduction of the
 Hebrew points into the Bible, these *ma-*
tres lectionis came into disuse, and began
 gradually

gradually to disappear out of the Text: however, the Text has never been so thoroughly cleared of them, but that they lie scattered up and down in several places of them; as נ, in 2 Sam. xii. 4. ^{הראש} for ^{הרש}; as ו, in Judg. xviii. 29. ^{ילד} for ^{ילד}; as י, Ib. xvi. 25. ^{כשוב} for ^{כשוב}. And that the account, which the Learned give of this matter, is true: I myself had an ocular demonstration, by looking into that very ancient MS. of Caius College, Cambridge, in which I found, Pf. cxlvii. 4. ^{לכולם} evidently pointed by a later hand, which we now read in the printed Text ^{רבם}, where it appears that the *mater lectionis* is thrown out, and *Kibbutz* is placed in its room.

• Vid. Lud. de Dieu Grammat. Ling. Orient. Lib. I. Cap. 2. Cappelli Arcan. Punct. Revel. Lib. I. Cap. 18. § 12. Waltoni Introd. &c. p. 9.

I shall take my leave, Sir, with ob-
 serving, That though there are some in-
 genious passages in them, such a spirit
 of spleen, envy, and ill-nature runs
 through the whole of these Letters, as
 does no great honour to Mr. L'Abbe ***
 Hebrew Professor of the University of
 the account, which the Learned

Jan. 16. 1776. I am, Sir, &c.

very ancient MS. of Coll. College, Cam-
 bridge, in which, &c. &c. &c. &c. &c.
 which we now read in the printed Text



• Vid. Lab. de Den Grammat. Ling. Orient. Lib. I.
 Cap. 1. Cappelh. Arian. Lang. Revel. Lib. I. Cap. 18.
 17. Watson. Lat. &c. p. 9.

I SHALL

